



**DRAFT**



City of Seattle

**FAMILIES AND EDUCATION LEVY  
LEVY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, October 11, 2011**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tim Burgess, Sandi Everlove, Holly Ferguson (SPS) for Susan Enfield, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, David Okimoto, Steve Sundquist, Kevin Washington, Greg Wong

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Ainsley Close (Mayor's Office), Jerry DeGriec (HSD), Betsy Graef (Council Staff), Sonja Griffin (HSD), Kathleen Groshong (HSD), Kacey Guin (OFE), Patricia Lee (City Council Central Staff), John McDonald (SPS), Holly Miller (OFE), Erica Mullen (YMCA), Isabel Muñoz-Colón (OFE), Janet Jones Preston (SPS), Elizabeth Shields (SPS), Sid Sidorowicz (OFE), Emily Yette (PHSKC)

Tim Burgess called the meeting to order. Introductions were made. The minutes were approved. T. Burgess noted that City Council members are being briefed on the Levy implementation planning. Holly Miller reviewed implementation planning to date, including the 19 workshops that were held for community-based organizations and schools interested in applying for Levy funds, as well as the timeline moving forward. T. Burgess asked how CBOs can receive direct funding, rather than through a school. H. Miller said that this is possible in early learning, community-based family support services, focused on refugee, immigrant and Native American students, and summer learning. Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis asked why there were only four elementary innovation schools per year. H. Miller said this was a funding issue and that the decision was made, prior to the plan being submitted to the City Council that elementary schools would be phased in at a rate of four per year. Sid Sidorowicz said that while we estimated the number of innovation sites in the planning process, we may not fund that exact number each year, depending on the quality of proposals received and the number of students being served at each school. Steve Sundquist asked if a school's ability to have stability in their staffing would factor into the innovation school decision. Holly Ferguson said that schools don't have the authority to do that, and that this issue would need to be negotiated. H. Miller noted that this was important to the Levy work, due to the turnover of Levy-funded staff in the past. She also noted the importance of extended time as part of the Levy investments. H. Ferguson said that stability in hiring did not work at the individual school level because of bumping rights. H. Miller said this would need to be discussed in more depth.

S. Sidorowicz reviewed the "Tracking to Results" document. David Okimoto said that the theory is that by focusing on low-performing students we are able to move the district as a whole. He asked if the district agrees with these targets. S. Sundquist said he agrees philosophically but noted that the targets may need to be adjusted as we get more information. S. Sidorowicz said these targets were based on CCER work, which focuses only on south-end schools, so the bar may be too low for the district as a whole. Kevin Washington said that these may also change, depending on the school district's new strategic plan goals. Greg Wong said that we may want to focus on end-of-course (EOC) math exams, to help us understand bigger issues along the pipeline that we might want to target earlier. L. Gaskill-Gaddis asked what grade was math EOC. H. Ferguson said 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade. S. Sidorowicz noted that the City puts some burden on the district related to data, and that there was funding in the proposed Levy to help ease that burden. He also noted the ongoing need for partners serving students to have access to real-time data, in order to be nimble and serve students appropriate and in a timely manner. S. Sundquist said that SPS should have Mark Teoh look at progression of targets to make sure they are attainable. H. Ferguson said she

would make sure Mark got copies of the Tracking to Results numbers tomorrow to provide comments.

Sonja Griffin provided highlights of the early learning implementation plan, focusing on the new elements of P-3 alignment and services to Family, Friend and Neighbor (FFN) providers. K. Washington asked if the P-3 approach was going to be iterative process. S. Griffin said yes, the professional development would need to be ongoing, with the student outcome data driving the next cycle of professional development. L. Gaskill-Gaddis noted the complication of dealing with two governmental entities sharing data. D. Okimoto asked if we should insist that there is an alignment between the preschool work and the K-3 grades. S. Griffin said that will be a requirement in the elementary innovation school RFI. Patricia Lee asked about efforts to align strategies in FFN to K-3. S. Griffin said that is the intent, with the common professional development and assessment across the early grades.

Isabel Muñoz-Colón provided highlights of the elementary implementation plan. K. Washington asked about issues identified for family support for Native American students, given how they are spread across the district, and wondered if there are other populations that pose implementation issues. I. Muñoz-Colón said that one thing keeps coming up are the different needs of older students who come to this county, so this funding may need to be flexible to serve older students. D. Okimoto asked if there were key outcomes we are trying to move. H. Miller noted the prime outcomes in the plans.

Kacey Guin provided highlights of the middle and high school implementation plans. L. Gaskill-Gaddis noted that all the strategies will be based in the innovation schools.

Jerry DeGrieck and Emily Yette provide highlights of health implementation plans. K. Washington had question for S. Sundquist if last VAX system in the state gone. S. Sundquist stated that the VAX system is no longer being used. S. Sidorowicz stated that the electronic tracking system for school health services has some real challenges because providers will need parent permission. K. Washington asked if students are assigned a solo student ID to address this issue. S. Sidorowicz said on an aggregate we can know the program's performance. Providers need the information to help individual students with issues like attendance. J. DeGrieck. said that this is a problem that has been solved in other areas of the state.

L. Gaskill-Gaddis appreciated the work that went in the implementation plans. She said it was really good information to share with the public about the Levy.